arXiv:1605.02539v1 [q-fin.MF] 9 May 2016

Robust framework for quantifying the value of information in pricing and hedging *

Anna Aksamit†, Zhaoxu Hou‡and Jan Obłój§

Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford
AWB, ROQ, Oxford OX2 6GG, UK

August 8, 2016

Abstract

We pursue the robust approach to pricing and hedging of financial derivatives. We investigate when the pricing–hedging duality for a regular agent, who only observes the stock prices, extends to agents with some additional information. We introduce a general framework to express the superhedging and market model prices for an informed agent. Our key insight is that an informed agent can be seen as a regular agent who can restrict her attention to a certain subset of possible paths. We use results of Hou & Obłój [22] on robust approach with beliefs to establish the pricing–hedging duality for an informed agent. Our results cover number of scenarios, including information arriving before trading starts, arriving after static position in European options is formed but before dynamic trading starts or arriving at some point before the maturity. For the latter we show that the superhedging value satisfies a suitable dynamic programming principle, which is of independent interest.

Keywords: robust superhedging, pricing–heding duality, informed investor, asymmetry of information, enlarged filtration, path restriction, dynamic programming principle, modelling with beliefs

1 Introduction

Robust approach to pricing and hedging has been an active field of research in mathematical finance over the recent years. In this approach, instead of choosing one model,

*The project has been generously supported by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement no. 335421. The authors also acknowledge the support of the Oxford-Man Institute of Quantitative Finance. Zhaoxu Hou is further grateful to Balliol College in Oxford and Jan Obłój to St John's College in Oxford for their financial support.

†E-mail: anna.aksamit@maths.ox.ac.uk
‡E-mail: zhaoxu.hou@maths.ox.ac.uk
§E-mail: jan.obloj@maths.ox.ac.uk

one considers superhedging simultaneously under a family of models, or pathwise on a set of feasible trajectories. Typically dynamic trading strategy in stocks and static trading, i.e. at time zero, in some European options are allowed. This setup was pioneered in the seminal work of Hobson [21] who obtained robust pricing and hedging bounds for look-back options. Therein, all martingale models which calibrate to the given market option prices, and superhedging for all canonical paths, were considered. Similar approach and setup, both in continuous and discrete time, were used to study other derivatives and abstract pricing–hedging duality questions, see e.g. [11, 15, 14, 16, 1, 7, 8, 19, 20, 12] and the references therein. Other papers, often intertwined with the previous stream, focused on the case when superhedging is only required under a given family of probability measures or, more recently, on a given set of feasible paths, see e.g. [27, 4, 29, 18, 10, 22] and the references therein.

The prevailing focus in the literature has been so far on the case when trading strategies are adapted to the natural filtration $\mathbb{F}$ of the price process S. In contrast, our main interest in this paper is to understand what happens when a larger filtration $\mathbb{G}$ is considered. One can think of $\mathbb{F}$ as the filtration of an unsophisticated or small agent and $\mathbb{G}$ as the filtration of a sophisticated agent who invests in acquiring additional information. Equally, $\mathbb{G}$ may correspond to the filtration of an insider. In general, the two filtrations model an asymmetry of information between the agents. We are primarily interested in the case when the additional information does not lead to instant arbitrage opportunities but does offer an advantage and we wish to quantify this advantage in the context of robust pricing and hedging of derivatives.

We develop pathwise approach. Our key insight is that the pricing and hedging problem for the agent with information in $\mathbb{G}$ can often be reduced to that for the standard agent who only considers a subset of the pathspace[1]. This allows us to use the duality results with beliefs obtained by Hou and Obłój [22]. Specifically, we consider the price process as the canonical process on a restriction of the space of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued continuous functions on $[0,T]$. Price process represents underlying stocks and possibly also continuously traded options. We further allow static position in options from a given set $\mathcal{X}$ with given prices $\mathcal{P}$. These are less liquid options which are not assumed to be traded after time zero. The additional information could arrive both before and/or after the static trading is executed. To account for this we add to $\mathbb{G}$ an additional element $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$, $\{\emptyset,\Omega\} \subset \mathcal{G}_{-1} \subset \mathcal{G}_0$ and require that the static position is $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$-measurable. The superhedging cost of a derivative with payoff ξ, for an agent with filtration $\mathbb{G}$, is then

$$V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)(\omega) := \inf\Big\{\mathcal{P}(X)(\omega) : \exists\ \mathbb{G}\text{-admissible}\ \ (X,\gamma)\ \text{ s.t. }\ X + \int_0^T \gamma_u dS_u \geq \xi \text{ on } \Omega\Big\},$$

where X is a portfolio of cash and options in $\mathcal{X}$. The pricing counterpart is obtained via

$$P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)(\omega) := \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi|\mathcal{G}_{-1})(\omega),$$

[1]When working on this paper we were made aware [2] of a related forthcoming paper which also considers informed agents using pathwise restrictions. However the technical setup therein is closely related to the pathwise approach developed in [5], based on Vovk's outer measure, and the paper develops a monotonicity principle in a similar sprit to [6].

where the supremum is taken over $\mathbb{G}$-martingale measures calibrated to market prices $\mathcal{P}$ of options in $\mathcal{X}$ and where we take a suitable version of the conditional expectations. We show that both $V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)$ and $P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)$ are well defined and constant on atoms of $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$.

We first focus on the case of an initial enlargement: $\mathcal{G}_0 = \sigma(Z)$, for some $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random variable Z. Initially, we treat the case when $\mathcal{G}_{-1} = \mathcal{G}_0$ and show that the duality for the informed agent is the same as duality for uninformed agents in Hou & Obłój [22] with beliefs of the form $\{\omega : Z(\omega) = c\}$. We discuss two examples: a very specific information $Z = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} |S_t - 1|$ and a rather vague information $Z = \mathbb{1}_{\{S_t\in(a,b)\ \forall t\in[0,T]\}}$. Subsequently, we show that the duality also extends to the case of trivial $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$, under mild technical assumptions on Z.

Secondly, we focus on the case when the additional information is disclosed at some time $T_1 \in (0,T)$, i.e. the filtration $\mathbb{G}$ is of the form: $\mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{F}_t$ for $t \in [0,T_1)$ and $\mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \vee \sigma(Z)$ for $t \in [T_1,T]$. To prove the pricing–hedging duality we establish a dynamic programming principle for both the superhedging cost $V(\xi)$ and the market model price $P(\xi)$. These are of independent interest even in the case of $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{G}$.

We note that the pricing problem for an informed agent was also examined recently in [3]. However the focus therein is very different to ours. The authors do not study the pricing–hedging duality but instead focus on the pricing aspect $P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)$ with a trivial $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$. They show that it is enough to optimise over extreme measures and characterise these, in analogy to the seminal work of Jacod-Yor [23], as ones under which semi-static completeness holds, i.e. perfect hedging of all suitably integrable ξ using the underlying assets and statically traded derivatives in $\mathcal{X}$. Under some further assumptions on $\mathbb{G}$, semi–static completeness under $\mathbb{Q}$ is equivalent to the filtrations $\mathbb{F}$ and $\mathbb{G}$ coinciding under $\mathbb{Q}$.

Our paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we define our robust pricing and hedging setup. In Section 3 we define the relevant pricing and hedging notions for the informed agents and establish their characterisations via pathspace restrictions. In Section 4 we present our main results on pricing–hedging duality under an initially enlarged filtration. Theorem 4.5 treats the case of instantly available information and Theorem 4.10 the case when the information may not be used to construct static portfolios. In Section 5 we study the dynamic situation when the additional information arrives at some time $T_1 \in (0,T)$. We establish relevant dynamic programming principles in Propositions 5.1 and 5.2, and then we obtain pricing–hedging duality result in Theorem 5.5.

2 General set-up

2.1 Traded assets

We consider a financial market with $d+1$ underlying assets: a numeraire and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ risky underlying assets. The prices are denominated in the units of the numeraire whose price is thus normalised to 1. We suppose that the prices of the d risky underlying assets belong to the space $\Omega^d := C_1([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d_+)$, i.e., the space of non-negative continuous functions f from $[0,T]$ into $\mathbb{R}^d_+$ such that $f_0 = (1,...,1)$. We endow Ω^d with the sup

norm $||f||_d := \sup_{t\leq T} |f_t|$ with $|f_t| := \sup_{1\leq n\leq d} |f_t^n|$ so that $(\Omega^d, ||\cdot||_d)$ is a Polish space. We will denote by $\mathcal{F}_T^d$ the Borel σ-field of subsets of $(\Omega^d, ||\cdot||_d)$ which is the σ-field generated by canonical process on Ω^d.

Apart from the risky underlying assets, there may be derivative products traded on the market. Some of these could be particularly liquid – we will assume they trade dynamically – and others may be less liquid and only available for trading at the initial time. We only consider European derivatives which can be seen as $\mathcal{F}_T^d$–measurable functions $X : \Omega^d \to \mathbb{R}$. In line with [22], we further assume all the payoffs X are bounded and uniformly continuous. The options traded at time zero are assumed to have a well defined price, denoted $\mathcal{P}(X)$. The set of market options available for static trading is denoted by $\mathcal{X}$. We consider here a frictionless setting with no transaction costs so that in particular $\mathcal{P}$ is a linear operator on $\mathcal{X}$. There are further K options, $K \geq 0$, with non-negative payoffs $X_1^{(c)}, ..., X_K^{(c)}$, which are traded dynamically. We normalise their payoffs so that their initial prices are equal to 1 and we model this situation by augmenting the set of risky assets. We simple consider $d + K$ assets that may be traded at any time, d underlyings and K options, with paths in an extended path space, Ω^{d+K}, with the norm $||\cdot|| := ||\cdot||_{d+K}$. Specifically, as the prices at maturity T must be consistent with payoffs, only the following subset of Ω^{d+K} is considered:

$$\Omega := \{\omega \in \Omega^{d+K} : \omega_T^{(d+i)} = X_i^{(c)}(\omega^{(1)}, ..., \omega^{(d)})/\mathcal{P}(X_i^{(c)}) \quad \forall i \leq K\}.$$

The space Ω was called the *information space* in [22] since it encodes the information about the initial prices and the payoffs of continuously traded options. We note that $(\Omega, ||\cdot||)$ is a Polish space since it is a closed subset of the Polish space $(\Omega^{d+K}, ||\cdot||)$.

2.2 Information

Let S be the canonical process on Ω, i.e., $S_t(\omega) := \omega_t$. We introduce the filtration $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\leq T}$ generated by S, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(S_s : s \leq t)$ for each $t \in [0, T]$. It is a right continuous filtration since S is a continuous process. Each element $\mathcal{F}_t$, or more generally $\mathcal{F}_\tau$ for a stopping time τ, is countably generated as the Borel σ-field on a Polish space.

We also consider an enlarged filtration $\mathbb{G} := (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t\leq T}$ defined as $\mathcal{G}_t := \mathcal{F}_t \vee \mathcal{H}_t$, for each $t \in [0, T]$, where $\mathbb{H} := (\mathcal{H}_t)_{t\leq T}$ is another filtration. In the literature, e.g. [24, 25, 28], typically two special cases of the filtration $\mathbb{H}$ are studied. First, the filtration $\mathbb{H}$ can be taken constant, $\mathcal{H}_t = \sigma(Z)$ where Z is a random variable, and $\mathbb{G}$ is then called the initial enlargement of $\mathbb{F}$ with Z. Second, the filtration $\mathbb{H}$ can be taken as $\mathcal{H}_t = \sigma(\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau\leq s\}} : s \leq t)$ where τ is a random time (non-negative random variable) and $\mathbb{G}$ is then called the progressive enlargement of $\mathbb{F}$ with a random time τ.

In our considerations it is important to specify *when* the additional information arrives – some decisions may have to be taken before and some after, the additional information is acquired. To model such situations, we add to each filtration $\mathbb{G}$ an additional element $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ with $\{\emptyset, \Omega\} \subset \mathcal{G}_{-1} \subset \mathcal{G}_0$. For a given arbitrary filtration $\mathbb{G}$ we denote by $\mathbb{G}^+$ the filtration such that $\mathcal{G}_{-1}^+ = \mathcal{G}_0$ and $\mathcal{G}_t^+ = \mathcal{G}_t$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Similarly, we denote by $\mathbb{G}^-$ the filtration such that $\mathcal{G}_{-1}^- = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_t^- = \mathcal{G}_t$ for $t \in [0, T]$. We note that for the natural filtration of the price process $\mathbb{F}$ the only choice is $\mathcal{F}_{-1} = \mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$.

2.3 Trading strategies

We now discuss the notion of atoms of a σ-field and introduce the right class of trading strategies with respect to a general filtration $\mathbb{G}$. We refer to Dellacherie & Meyer [17] Chapter 1 § 9-12 pages 14-16 for useful details.

For a measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T)$ and a sub σ-field $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}_T$ we introduce the following equivalence relation.

Definition 2.1. *Let ω and $\widetilde{\omega}$ be two elements of Ω, and $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}_T$ be a σ-field. Then we say that ω and $\widetilde{\omega}$ are $\mathcal{G}$-equivalent, and write $\omega \sim_{\mathcal{G}} \widetilde{\omega}$, if for each $G \in \mathcal{G}$ we have $\mathbb{1}_G(\omega) = \mathbb{1}_G(\widetilde{\omega})$.*

We call $\mathcal{G}$-atoms the equivalence classes in Ω with respect to this relation. We denote by A^ω the atom which contains ω: $A^\omega = \bigcap\{A : A \in \mathcal{G}, \omega \in A\}$.

Note that if $\mathcal{G}$ is countably generated, $\mathcal{G} = \sigma(B_n : n \geq 1)$, then each atom is an element of $\mathcal{G}$ as $A^\omega = \bigcap_n C_n$ is a countable intersection, where $C_n = B_n$ if $\omega \in B_n$ and $C_n = B_n^c$ if $\omega \in B_n^c$. Also, it is then enough to check the relation from Definition 2.1 on the generators of $\mathcal{G}$. Finally, we note that in our setting, $\omega \sim_{\mathcal{F}_t} \widetilde{\omega}$ if and only if $\omega_u = \widetilde{\omega}_u$ for each $u \leq t$; and $\omega \sim_{\sigma(Z)} \widetilde{\omega}$ if and only if $Z(\omega) = Z(\widetilde{\omega})$.

We only consider trading strategies γ which are of finite variation. This allows, similarly to [19, 22], to define stochastic integrals pathwise simply via the integration by parts formula:

$$\int_0^t \gamma(u) d\omega(u) := \gamma(t)\omega(t) - \gamma(0)\omega(0) - \int_0^t \omega(u) d\gamma(u), \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

Definition 2.2. *(i) We say that a mapping $\gamma : \Omega \to \mathcal{D}([0,T], \mathbb{R}^{d+K})$ is $\mathbb{G}$-adapted if for every $\omega, \widetilde{\omega} \in \Omega$ and every $t \in [0,T]$ we have*

$$\omega \sim_{\mathcal{G}_t} \widetilde{\omega} \quad \textit{implies} \quad \gamma(\omega)_t = \gamma(\widetilde{\omega})_t. \tag{1}$$

(ii) Let $M \in \mathrm{L}^0(\Omega, \mathcal{G}_0)$, the space of $\mathcal{G}_0$-measurable random variables. We say that $\gamma : \Omega \to \mathcal{D}([0,T], \mathbb{R}^{d+K})$ is $(\mathbb{G}, M)$-admissible if it is $\mathbb{G}$-adapted and of finite variation, satisfying

$$\int_0^t \gamma(\omega)_u dS_u(\omega) \geq -M(\omega) \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T],\ \omega \in \Omega\,. \tag{2}$$

The set of all $(\mathbb{G}, M)$-admissible strategies is denoted $\mathcal{A}^M(\mathbb{G})$. The set of all $\mathbb{G}$-admissible strategies is defined by

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{G}) := \bigcup_{M \in \mathrm{L}^0(\Omega, \mathcal{G}_0)} \mathcal{A}^M(\mathbb{G}). \tag{3}$$

Finally, when the admissibility (2) is only required on some time interval $[T_1, T_2]$ we write $\mathcal{A}^M(\mathbb{G}, [T_1, T_2])$ and $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{G}, [T_1, T_2])$ for the respective sets of trading strategies.
(iii) A $(\mathbb{G}, M)$-admissible semi-static strategy is a pair (X, γ) where

$$X = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i X_i \quad \textit{and} \quad \gamma \in \mathcal{A}^M(\mathbb{G})$$

for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$-measurable random variables a_i, $i = 0, 1, ..., m$. Initial cost of such a strategy is $\mathcal{P}(X) = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \mathcal{P}(X_i)$.
The set of all $(\mathbb{G}, M)$-admissible semi-static strategies is denoted by $\mathcal{A}^M_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbb{G})$ and all $\mathbb{G}$-admissible semi-static strategies are given by

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbb{G}) := \bigcup_{M \in \mathrm{L}^0(\Omega, \mathcal{G}_0)} \mathcal{A}^M_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbb{G}). \tag{4}$$

3 Pathspace approach to information quantification

We are now in a position to define the main quantities of interest: the robust pricing and hedging prices of an option. We work with a general filtration $\mathbb{G}$ and this induces further difficulties, as compared with the case of the natural filtration $\mathbb{F}$.

We start with superhedging problem.

Definition 3.1. *Let $A \subset \Omega$. The $\mathbb{G}$-superhedging cost of ξ on A is given by*

$$V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi)(\omega) := \inf\{\mathcal{P}(X)(\omega) : \quad \exists\, (X, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbb{G}) \text{ such that } X(\omega^{(1)}, ..., \omega^{(d)}) + \int_0^T \gamma(\omega)_u dS_u(\omega) \geq \xi(\omega)\ \forall \omega \in A\}.$$

Thus the $\mathbb{G}$-superhedging cost of ξ on A is the infimum over all initial costs $\mathcal{P}(X)$ of $\mathbb{G}$-admissible strategies $(X, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbb{G})$ which super–replicate ξ on A over $[0, T]$ i.e., $X + \gamma \bullet S_T \geq \xi$ on A. When a different time horizon is considered, e.g. $[T_1, T_2]$, we make it explicit. We have the following obvious inequalities:

$$V^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi) \leq V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi) \leq V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi) \leq V^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi).$$

We now show that the superhedging cost is constant on the atoms on $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$.

Proposition 3.2. *The $\mathbb{G}$-superhedging cost of ξ on Ω, defined in Definition 3.1, is constant on atoms of $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$. Specifically, for any $\omega \in \Omega$ we have*

$$V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)(\omega) = V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)(\omega') = V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi)(\omega') \quad \forall \omega' \in A^\omega,$$

where A^ω denotes the $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$-atom containing ω. In particular,

$$\forall \omega' \in A^\omega \quad V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi)(\omega) = V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi)(\omega').$$

Proof: Fix $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\omega' \in A^\omega$. It follows from $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$–measurability that $\mathcal{P}(X)(\omega) = \mathcal{P}(X)(\omega')$ for any $\mathbb{G}$-admissible strategy $(X, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbb{G})$ which super–replicates ξ on A^ω. This in turn implies that

$$V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi)(\omega) = V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi)(\omega').$$

It remains to argue that these are also equal to $V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)(\omega')$. Clearly the latter can only be larger. As for the reverse inequality, note that any $\mathbb{G}$-admissible semi-static strategy (X,γ) which super–replicates ξ on A^ω can be extended to a strategy $(\bar{X},\bar{\gamma})$ super–replicating on Ω by taking $\bar{X}=X$ on A^ω and $\bar{a}_0=||\xi||$ otherwise, $\bar{\gamma}=\gamma\mathbb{1}_{A^\omega}$. $\square$

Note that $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$–measurable and hence $V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi)$ is random but its measurability is not clear *a priori*. However if $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ is generated by a discrete random variable then it has at most countably many atoms. Since $V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)$ is constant on atoms of $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$, it then follows that it is $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$-measurable. With a slight abuse of notation, we denote

$$V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi) := V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)_{|A^\omega},$$

the superhedging price on an atom A^ω in $\mathbb{G}_{-1}$.

We now turn to the pricing problem. In the classical approach markets with no-arbitrage are modelled using martingale measures. We denote by $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}$ probability measures on $(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_T)$ such that S is a $\mathbb{G}$–martingale. For a given $A\in\mathcal{F}_T$, we look at possible classical market models which calibrate to market prices of options and are supported on A:

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A} := \left\{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}} : \mathbb{P}(A)=1 \text{ and } \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(X|\mathcal{G}_{-1})=\mathcal{P}(X) \text{ for all } X\in\mathcal{X},\ \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}\right\}.$$

Now we would like to give a precise meaning to the expression "$\sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi|\mathcal{G}_{-1})$". Unless $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ is a trivial σ-field, the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi|\mathcal{G}_{-1})$ is a random variable which is determined only $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.. As measures in the set $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}$ may be mutually singular we have to be careful about choosing a good version of these conditional expectations.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume each element of $\mathbb{G}$ is countably generated. Let $\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}$. Then, there exists a set $\Omega^{\mathbb{P}}\in\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega^{\mathbb{P}})=1$ and a version $\{\mathbb{P}_\omega\}$ of the regular conditional probabilities of $\mathbb{P}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ such that for each $\omega\in\Omega^{\mathbb{P}}$, $\mathbb{P}_\omega\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}$ where A^ω is the $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$-atom containing ω.*

Proof: Existence of $\mathbb{P}_\omega$ and its properties are all classical results, see Stroock & Varadhan [31, pp. 12–16]. The property that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. $\mathbb{P}_\omega(A^\omega)=1$ and that $\Omega^{\mathbb{P}}$ can be taken to be in $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ come from the fact that $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ is countably generated.
Fix $t\geq s$ and $G\in\mathcal{G}_s$. Then, since $G_0:=\{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}((S_t-S_s)\mathbb{1}_G)>0\}\in\mathcal{G}_{-1}$, we get

$$0=\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}((S_t-S_s)\mathbb{1}_{G\cap G_0})=\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}((S_t-S_s)\mathbb{1}_G|\mathcal{G}_{-1})\mathbb{1}_{G_0})=\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}((S_t-S_s)\mathbb{1}_G)\mathbb{1}_{G_0}),$$

which implies that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}((S_t-S_s)\mathbb{1}_G)\leq 0$. In the same way we prove that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}((S_t-S_s)\mathbb{1}_G)\geq 0$. So finally, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}((S_t-S_s)\mathbb{1}_G)=0$. To conclude that $\mathbb{P}$-almost every $\mathbb{P}_\omega$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-martingale measure we use continuity of paths of S and the assumption that each element $\mathcal{G}_s$ is countably generated. To end the proof we note that

$$\mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}\quad \forall X\in\mathcal{X}\quad \mathcal{P}(X)=\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(X|\mathcal{G}_{-1})=\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}(X).$$

$\square$

Suppose now that we fix a representation $\Omega^{\mathbb{P}}$ in Proposition 3.3 for each $\mathbb{P}\in M^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}$ and use these to define the market model price as follows:

Definition 3.4. *Let $A \in \mathcal{F}_T$. The $\mathbb{G}$-market model price of ξ on A is defined by*

$$P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi)(\omega) := \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}} \bar{\mathbb{E}}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}(\xi), \quad \omega \in \Omega,$$

where $\bar{\mathbb{E}}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}(\xi) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}(\xi)$ for $\omega \in \Omega^{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{E}}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}(\xi) = -\infty$ for $\omega \in \Omega\backslash\Omega^{\mathbb{P}}$.

We note the following obvious inequalities:

$$P^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi) \le P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi) \le P^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi) \le P^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A}(\xi).$$

We now show that, as in the case of superhedging, the model price is constant on atoms of $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ and is uniquely defined, irrespective of the choice of $\Omega^{\mathbb{P}}$ above.

Proposition 3.5. *The $\mathbb{G}$-market model price of ξ on Ω is uniquely defined on Ω and is constant on atoms of $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$. Specifically, for $\omega \in \Omega$ we have*

$$P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)(\omega) = P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)(\omega') = P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi)(\omega') = \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi), \quad \forall \omega' \in A^\omega,$$

where A^ω is the $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$-atom containing ω.

Proof: Note that if $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}$, then $A^\omega \subset \Omega^{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\omega'} = \mathbb{P}$ for all $\omega' \in A^\omega$. In particular, $P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi)(\omega') = \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi)$ for all $\omega' \in A^\omega$, i.e. $P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi)$ is well defined and constant on A^ω. Further, the obvious inclusion $M^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega} \subset \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}$ combined with Proposition 3.3, show that the set $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}$ is composed of conditional probabilities of measures in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}$. In consequence,

$$P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)(\omega') = P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi)(\omega'), \quad \omega' \in A^\omega$$

are required. In particular, $P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)$ is well defined and constant on atoms and does not depend on the choice of $\Omega^{\mathbb{P}}$ for $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}$. Finally, if for some $\omega \in \Omega$, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega} = \emptyset$ then, for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}$, $\Omega^{\mathbb{P}} \cap A^\omega = \emptyset$ and the definitions agree giving

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\omega) = -\infty.$$

□

Note that in general the measurability of $P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)$ is not clear. However, when $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ is generated by a discrete random variable then it has at most countably many atoms and $P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)$ is $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$-measurable. With a slight abuse of notation, we denote

$$P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}(\xi) := \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) = P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)_{|A^\omega}$$

its value on an atom $A^\omega \in \mathbb{G}_{-1}$. This representation implies that it is sufficient to focus on measures supported on a single atom. We note that these are not necessarily the extreme measures in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}$.

Corollary 3.6. *When computing the $\mathbb{G}$-market model price of ξ on Ω, or on some set in $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$, it is sufficient to maximise over measures supported on a single atom of $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$.*

We turn now to the easy inequality in the pricing–hedging duality.

Lemma 3.7. *The $\mathbb{G}$-superhedging cost $V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)$ and the $\mathbb{G}$-market model price $P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)$ of ξ on Ω satisfy*

$$V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)(\omega) \geq P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi)(\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega\,.$$

Proof: Using Propositions 3.2 and 3.5, it is enough to show the asserted inequality separately on each atom A^ω of the σ-field $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$. The proof then follows by a classical argument. Take any $\mathbb{G}$-super–replicating portfolio $(X,\gamma) \in \mathcal{A}^M(\mathbb{G})$ on A^ω and any measure $\mathbb{P} \in M^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},A^\omega}$. Let $\{\mathbb{P}_v\}$ denote regular conditional probabilities of $\mathbb{P}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}_0$. Thus, by Proposition 3.3, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., $\mathbb{P}_v \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{B^v}$ where $\{B^v\}$ are $\mathcal{G}_0$-atoms containing v. Note that $\{B^v\}$ form finer partition than $\{A^\omega\}$. Then, since $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., $\mathbb{P}_v(M \equiv const) = 1$, we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_v}(\xi) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_v}\left(X + \int_0^T \gamma_u dS_u\right) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_v}(X) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

since $\int_0^\cdot \gamma_u dS_u$ is a $\mathbb{G}$-local martingale bounded from below and thus a $\mathbb{G}$-supermartingale. Since $\{\mathbb{P}_v\}$ are regular conditional probabilities of $\mathbb{P}$, taking expectations under $\mathbb{P}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(X + \int_0^T \gamma_u dS_u\right) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(X) = \mathcal{P}(X)$$

which completes the proof. □

4 Pricing–hedging duality under initially enlarged filtration

We turn to the main question in this paper: namely when a pricing–hedging duality holds in the enlarged filtration? That is, when the inequality in Lemma 3.7 is in fact an equality? We start with the case when $\mathbb{G}$ is an initial enlargement of $\mathbb{F}$. Then, γ is $\mathbb{G}$-progressively measurable if and only if $\gamma(\omega)_t = \gamma(\widetilde{\omega})_t$ whenever $\omega|_{[0,t]} = \widetilde{\omega}|_{[0,t]}$ and $\omega \sim_{\mathcal{G}_0} \widetilde{\omega}$.

4.1 Preliminaries: pricing–hedging duality with beliefs

We start by recalling notions and results from Hou & Obłój [22]. As explained before, we use their setup with beliefs to *zoom on* the part of the pathspace considered by an informed agent. For $\mathfrak{P} \in \mathcal{F}_T$ let $\widetilde{V}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}}(\xi)$ be the approximate $\mathbb{F}$-superhedging cost of ξ on $\mathfrak{P}$, i.e.,

$$\widetilde{V}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}}(\xi) := \inf\{\mathcal{P}(X) : \quad \exists (X,\gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbb{F}) \text{ such that}$$
$$X(\omega^{(1)},...,\omega^{(d)}) + \int_0^T \gamma(\omega)_u dS_u(\omega) \geq \xi(\omega) \;\; \forall\, \omega \in \mathfrak{P}(\varepsilon) \quad \text{for some} \quad \varepsilon > 0\},$$

where

$$\mathfrak{P}(\varepsilon) = \{\omega \in \Omega : \inf_{\widetilde{\omega}\in\mathfrak{P}} ||\omega - \widetilde{\omega}|| \leq \varepsilon\}. \tag{5}$$

Similarly, let $\widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}}(\xi)$ be the approximate $\mathbb{F}$-market model price of ξ, i.e.,

$$\widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}}(\xi) := \lim_{\eta\searrow 0} \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F},\eta}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi)$$

with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F},\eta}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}} := \{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\Omega} : \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{P}(\eta)) > 1-\eta \text{ and } |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(X) - \mathcal{P}(X)| < \eta \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{X}\ \}$. The following assumption says that the set $\mathcal{X}$ is not too large, and initial prices of dynamically traded options are not "on the boundary of no-arbitrage region".

Assumption 4.1. *(i) $Lin_1(\mathcal{X})$ is a compact subset of $C(\Omega,\mathbb{R})$, where*

$$Lin_N(\mathcal{X}) := \{a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i X_i : m \in \mathbb{N},\ X_i \in \mathcal{X},\ \sum_{i=0}^{m} |a_i| \leq N\}. \tag{6}$$

(ii) Either $K = 0$ or there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $(p_k)_{k\leq K}$ with $|\mathcal{P}(X_k^{(c)}) - p_k| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $k \leq K$, $\mathcal{M}_{\widetilde{\Omega}} \neq \emptyset$ where

$$\widetilde{\Omega} = \{\omega \in \Omega : S_T^{(d+i)}(\omega) = X_i^{(c)}(\omega)/p_i) \quad \forall i \leq K\}.$$

Theorem 4.2 (Hou & Obłój [22])**.** *Suppose that Assumption 4.1 holds. Let $\mathfrak{P} \in \mathcal{F}_T$ be such that $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F},\eta}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}} \neq \emptyset$ for any $\eta > 0$. Then, for any uniformly continuous and bounded ξ, the approximate pricing–hedging duality holds:*

$$\widetilde{V}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}}(\xi) = \widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}}(\xi).$$

We also isolate the following general fact which extends the pricing–hedging duality without static hedging to the general case using a min–max type of argument.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be an* arbitrary *filtration such that $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ is a trivial σ-field. Let $\mathcal{X}$ satisfies Assumption 4.1 and assume that $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega} \neq \emptyset$. Moreover assume that there is pricing–hedging duality for the model without options, i.e., $P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\Omega}(\xi) = V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\Omega}(\xi)$ for all uniformly continuous and bounded ξ. Then there is pricing–hedging duality for the model with options, i.e.,*

$$P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi) = V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi) \quad \text{for all uniformly continuous and bounded } \xi.$$

Proof: We use a calculus of variations argument similarly to Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of [22]. We have, with $Lin_N(\mathcal{X})$ defined in (6) and $Lin(\mathcal{X}) = \cup_N Lin_N(\mathcal{X})$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi) &= \inf\{\mathcal{P}(X) : \exists (X,\gamma) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbb{G}) \text{ such that } X + \gamma \centerdot S \geq \xi \text{ on } \Omega\} \\
&= \inf_{X\in Lin(\mathcal{X})} \{\mathcal{P}(X) + \inf\{x : \exists\, \gamma \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{G}) \text{ such that } x + \gamma \centerdot S \geq \xi - X \text{ on } \Omega\}\} \\
&= \inf_{X\in Lin(\mathcal{X})} \{\mathcal{P}(X) + V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\Omega}(\xi - X)\} \\
&= \inf_{X\in Lin(\mathcal{X})} \{\mathcal{P}(X) + P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\Omega}(\xi - X)\} \\
&= \lim_{N\to\infty} \inf_{X\in Lin_N(\mathcal{X})} \{\sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\Omega}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi - X) + \mathcal{P}(X)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define the function $f : Lin_N(\mathcal{X}) \times \mathcal{M}_\Omega^{\mathbb{G}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $f(X, \mathbb{P}) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi - X) + \mathcal{P}(X)$. Note that f is linear and continuous in the first variable due to bounded convergence theorem. It is also linear and continuous in the second variable. Then, since $Lin_N(\mathcal{X})$ is convex and compact, minmax Theorem (Corollary 2 in Terkelsen [32]) implies that

$$\inf_{X \in Lin_N(\mathcal{X})} \sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_\Omega^{\mathbb{G}}} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi - X) + \mathcal{P}(X)) = \sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_\Omega^{\mathbb{G}}} \inf_{X \in Lin_N(\mathcal{X})} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi - X) + \mathcal{P}(X)).$$

Since ξ is bounded, it follows that for $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_\Omega^{\mathbb{G}} \backslash \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}^{\mathbb{G}}$ the quantity $\inf_{X \in Lin_N(\mathcal{X})}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi - X) + \mathcal{P}(X))$ can be made arbitrarily small by taking large N. Since $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}^{\mathbb{G}}$ is not empty, we obtain the desired equality. □

4.2 Duality in an enlarged filtration: case of $\mathbb{G}^+$

From Theorem 4.2, taking $\mathfrak{P}$ to be atoms in $\mathcal{G}_{-1}^+ = \mathcal{G}_0$, we can deduce a pricing–hedging duality in the enlarged filtration. We isolate the following assumption which is often invoked.

Assumption 4.4. *The set $\mathfrak{P} \subset \Omega$ is such that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}}^{\mathbb{F}} \neq \emptyset$, and*

$$P_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}}^{\mathbb{F}}(\xi) = V_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\mathfrak{P}}^{\mathbb{F}}(\xi) \quad \text{for any bounded uniformly continuous } \xi. \tag{7}$$

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose Assumption 4.1 holds and let Z be a random variable and $\mathbb{G} := \mathbb{F} \vee \sigma(Z)$. Assume that for each value $c \in Z(\Omega)$ either $\{Z = c\}$ satisfies Assumption 4.4 or $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}^{\mathbb{F}} = \emptyset$. Then, there is no duality gap in $\mathbb{G}^+$ on the set $\{\omega : \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=Z(\omega)\}}^{\mathbb{F}} \neq \emptyset\}$, i.e., $V_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}^{\mathbb{G}^+}(\xi)(\omega) = P_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}^{\mathbb{G}^+}(\xi)(\omega)$ holds for any ω such that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=Z(\omega)\}}^{\mathbb{F}} \neq \emptyset$ and any bounded uniformly continuous ξ.*

Proof: In the first step we prove that for each value $c \in Z(\Omega)$ such that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}^{\mathbb{F}} \neq \emptyset$ we have

$$P_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}^{\mathbb{F}}(\xi) = P_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}^{\mathbb{G}^+}(\xi) \leq V_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}^{\mathbb{G}^+}(\xi) = V_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}^{\mathbb{F}}(\xi). \tag{8}$$

First let us prove the last equality. To this end note that any $\mathbb{G}^+$-progressively measurable process γ is of the form $\gamma(\omega)_t = \Gamma(Z(\omega), t, \omega)$ where for each $t \in [0,T]$ the mapping $\Gamma : \mathbb{R} \times [0,t] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_+^{d+K}$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{B}([0,t]) \otimes \mathcal{F}_s$-measurable. So there exists $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable process $\gamma^{\mathbb{F}}$ given by $\gamma^{\mathbb{F}}(t,\omega) = \Gamma(c,t,\omega)$ which is equal to γ on $\{Z = c\}$ thus the last equality in (8) follows.
To show the first equality, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}^{\mathbb{G}^+} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}^{\mathbb{F}}$. For any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}^{\mathbb{F}}$ and $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(S_t|\mathcal{G}_s^+) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(S_t|\mathcal{F}_s \vee \sigma(Z)) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(S_t|\mathcal{F}_s^{\mathbb{P}})|\mathcal{F}_s \vee \sigma(Z)) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(S_s|\mathcal{F}_s \vee \sigma(Z)) = S_s,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_s^{\mathbb{P}}$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-completion of $\mathcal{F}_s$, showing $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}^{\mathbb{G}^+}$. The reverse inclusion is clear. Finally, the middle inequality in (8) is implied by Lemma 3.7.

Finally, by representations given in Propositions 3.2 and 3.5, the proof is completed since we get that $V^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}(\xi) = P^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}(\xi)$ for any value $c \in Z(\Omega)$ for which $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}} \neq \emptyset$ and any bounded uniformly continuous claim ξ. □

Remark 4.6. *Under Assumption 4.1, thanks to Theorem 4.2, we have*

$$\widetilde{V}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}(\xi) = \widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}(\xi). \tag{9}$$

Combining inequality (9) *with general following inequalities*

$$P^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}(\xi) \leq V^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}(\xi) \leq \widetilde{V}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}(\xi)$$

we conclude that in Theorem 4.5, instead of assuming that (7) *holds, it is enough to assume that*

$$P^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}(\xi) \leq \widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\{Z=c\}}(\xi).$$

We present two examples where the informed agent has some additional knowledge about the price process at the terminal date. We consider two extreme situations: first when the informed agent gets rather detailed information and there is a continuum of atoms, second when the informed agent gets binary information (and $\mathcal{G}_{-1}$ only has two atoms). In both cases we only consider the situation with no static trading: $\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$ and such that pricing–hedging duality in $\mathbb{G}^+$ holds.

Example 4.7. We consider a one-dimensional setting with no statically or dynamically traded options: $d = 1$, $K = 0$ and $\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$. The informed agent acquires detailed knowledge of the stock prices process: namely she knows the maximum deviation over time interval $[0, T]$ of the stock price from the initial price. Naturally, the agent does not know the sign of the deviation as this would give an instant arbitrage. This situation corresponds to taking $Z = \sup_{t\in[0,T]} |S_t - 1|$.

For $c > 1$, the market model price $P^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}(\xi) = -\infty$ as any martingale measure $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}$ would satisfy

$$1 = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \geq 1 + c\right) \leq \frac{1}{1+c} < 1,$$

thus the set of martingale measures $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}$ must be empty. Likewise the super–hedging cost $V^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}(\xi) = -\infty$ as a long position in the stock generates arbitrage.

Fix $c \leq 1$. Our proof is similar to Example 3.12 in [22]. Firstly observe that under any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}$, S is uniformly integrable martingale with $S = S^{\tau_c}$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. where $\tau_c := \inf\{t : S_t \in \{1 + c, 1 - c\}\}$.

For each N there exists a measure $\mathbb{P}^N \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F},1/N}_{\{Z=c\}}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\xi) \geq \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F},1/N}_{\{Z=c\}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) - \frac{1}{N}.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}^N$ is a martingale measure for S, Doob's martingale inequality implies:

$$\mathbb{P}^N(||S|| > M) \leq \frac{1}{M},$$

and then, defining $\tau_M := \inf\{t : S_t = M\}$ for an arbitrary large M, leads to:

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\xi(S) - \xi(S^{\tau_M}))| \leq \frac{2||\xi||}{M}.$$

Let π^N be the distribution of $S_T^{\tau_M}$ under $\mathbb{P}^N$, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\pi^N([0, M]) = 1$ for each N, this is a tight family of probability measures and therefore a converging subsequence $(\pi^{N_k})_k$ exists. Denote the limit of $(\pi^{N_k})_k$ by π and note that, since each measure π^N has mean equal to one so does π.
For each $\varepsilon > 0$, weak convergence of measures and Portemanteau Theorem imply that

$$\pi([1 - c - \varepsilon, 1 + c + \varepsilon]) \geq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \pi^{N_k}([1 - c - \varepsilon, 1 + c + \varepsilon]) = 1 \tag{10}$$

since, letting $U_N := [1 - c - \frac{1}{N}, 1 + c + \frac{1}{N}]$, one has

$$\mathbb{P}^N(S_T^{\tau_M} \in U_N) = \mathbb{P}^N(||S|| \leq M,\ S_T \in U_N) \geq \mathbb{P}^N(||S|| \leq b + 1,\ S_T \in U_N) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{N}.$$

It holds for each $\varepsilon > 0$ hence $\pi([1 - c, 1 + c]) = 1$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=c\}} &= \lim_{N\to\infty} \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\underline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbb{F},1/N}_{\{Z=c\}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) \leq \lim_{N\to\infty} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\xi) + \frac{1}{N}\right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\underline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbb{F}} \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{L}(S_T)=\pi^{N_k}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) + \frac{2\|\xi\|}{M} \\
&\leq \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\underline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbb{F}} \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{L}(S_T)=\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) + \frac{2\|\xi\|}{M} \leq \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\underline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=c\}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) + \frac{2d\|\xi\|}{M}
\end{aligned}$$

where the fourth inequality holds by Lemma 4.4 in [22] and the fifth since under any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=c\}}$ the distribution of S_T equals π. Since M was arbitrary we obtain that $\widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=c\}} \leq P^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=c\}}$ and by Theorem 4.5 and Remark 4.6 we conclude that there is no duality gap in $\mathbb{G}^+$.

Example 4.8. Assume $\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$, $d = 1$ and $K = 0$. Take $Z = \mathbb{1}_{\{S_t\in(a,b)\ \forall t\in[0,T]\}}$ where $a < 1 < b$. We use Theorem 4.5 to show that the pricing–hedging holds in $\mathbb{G}^+$.
Equality $P^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=0\}}(\xi) = \widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=0\}}(\xi)$ follows by the same arguments used in the previous example and the proof of Example 3.12 in [22] since the set $[0, a] \cup [b, M]$ is compact for any M. The only difference lies in arguing analogous inequality as in (10). Here we have

$$\pi([0, a + \varepsilon] \cup [b - \varepsilon, \infty)) \geq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \pi^{N_k}([0, a + \varepsilon] \cup [b - \varepsilon, \infty)) = 1$$

since

$$\mathbb{P}^N(S_T^{\tau_M} \in [0, a+1/N] \cup [b-1/N, \infty)) \geq \mathbb{P}^N(S_T \in [0, a+1/N] \cup [b-1/N, \infty)) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{N}.$$

It holds for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and hence $\pi([0,a] \cup [b,\infty)) = 1$.

To prove second equality that $P^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=1\}}(\xi) = \widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=1\}}(\xi)$ we first note that, again by the same type of arguments as in the proof on Example 3.12, for the interval $[a,b]$ we have

$$P^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{S_t \in [a,b]\ \forall t \in [0,T]\}}(\xi) = \widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{S_t \in [a,b]\ \forall t \in [0,T]\}}(\xi) = \widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=1\}}.$$

Thus, in order to show that $P^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=1\}}(\xi) = \widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=1\}}(\xi)$ it is enough to prove that

$$P^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{S_t \in [a,b]\ \forall t \in [0,T]\}}(\xi) = P^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=1\}}(\xi).$$

Take $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{S_t \in [a,b]\ \forall t \in [0,T]\}}$. For each $k \in (0,1)$ define $\widetilde{S}^k$ as

$$\widetilde{S}^k_t(\omega) := k\omega_t + (1-k) \quad \text{for} \quad \omega \in \{S_t \in [a,b] \ \ \forall t \in [0,T]\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P} \circ (\widetilde{S}^k)^{-1} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{S_T \in (a,b)\}} \quad \text{and} \quad ||\widetilde{S}^k(\omega) - \omega|| \leq (1-k)[(b-1) \vee (1-a)].$$

Thus

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi \circ \widetilde{S}^k)| \leq e_\xi((1-k)[(b-1) \vee (1-a)])$$

and, since k is arbitrary close to 1, there exists sequence of measures $\mathbb{P}^N \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{S_T \in (a,b)\}}$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^N}(\xi)$.

4.3 Duality in an enlarged filtration: case of $\mathbb{G}^-$

Theorem 4.10 concerns the pricing–hedging duality in $\mathbb{G}^-$. We recall that $\mathcal{G}^-_{-1} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ which models the situation when the static position in options has to be determined before acquiring any additional information. In order to formulate the results we need to introduce further conditions on Z, namely:

Assumption 4.9. *There exists a countable subset $\{c_n\}_n$ of $Z(\Omega)$ such that for each sequence $\{\eta^n\}_n$ of positive real numbers there exists a family $\{\widetilde{\Sigma}^n\}_n$ of $\sigma(Z)$-measurable sets satisfying: $\Omega = \bigcup_n \widetilde{\Sigma}^n$ and that for each $\widetilde{\omega} \in \widetilde{\Sigma}^n$ there exists an $\omega \in \{Z = c_n\}$ such that $||\widetilde{\omega} - \omega|| \leq \eta^n$.*

Remark that Assumption 4.9 is satisfied when:

- Z is a discrete random variable since it is enough to take $\{c_n\}_n = Z(\Omega)$ and $\widetilde{\Sigma}^n = \{Z = c\}$;

- Z is a continuous random variable then it is enough to take $\{c_n\}$ a countable dense subset of $Z(\Omega)$ containing levels c such that there exists $\omega \in \{Z = c\}$ and $r > 0$ such that $\{v : ||v - \omega|| \leq r\} \subset \{Z = c\}$ (level sets with non empty interior) and $\widetilde{\Sigma}^n = \{c_n - \varepsilon_n \leq Z \leq \varepsilon_n + c_n\}$ where $\varepsilon_n \geq 0$ are chosen regarding η^n. Note that above is possible since there can be only countable number of level sets with not empty interior.

Theorem 4.10. *Let Z be a random variable such that for each $c \in Z(\Omega)$ the set $\{Z = c\}$ satisfies Assumption 4.4 with no options ($\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$) and that Assumption 4.9 holds. Define $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{F} \vee \sigma(Z)$. Assume moreover that $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega} \neq \emptyset$ and that Assumption 4.1 holds. Then pricing–hedging duality holds in $\mathbb{G}^-$:*

$$V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi) = P^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi) \quad \forall \text{ bounded uniformly continuous } \xi.$$

Proof: In the first step of the proof we assume that $\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$ and we prove the following sequence of equalities

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\Omega}(\xi) &= \sup_{c \in Z(\Omega)} V^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}(\xi) = \sup_{c \in Z(\Omega)} P^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}(\xi) \\ &= \sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \bigcup_{c \in Z(\Omega)} \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) = \sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\Omega}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) = P^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\Omega}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Let us start with first equality. Note that, under Assumption 4.4, one has

$$V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\{Z=c\}}(\xi) = \widetilde{V}^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\{Z=c\}}(\xi).$$

Let $\{c_n\}_n$ be a subset from Assumption 4.9. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, for each n, there exists $\eta^n > 0$ such that

$$V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\widetilde{\Sigma}^n}(\xi) - V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\{Z=c_n\}}(\xi) \leq \varepsilon/2.$$

Next, there exist $x^n \in \mathbb{R}$, M^n and $\gamma^n \in \mathcal{A}^{M^n}(\mathbb{G})$ such that

$$x^n - V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\widetilde{\Sigma}^n} \leq \varepsilon/2 \quad \text{and} \quad x^n + \gamma^n \bullet S \geq \xi \quad \text{on} \quad \widetilde{\Sigma}^n.$$

We build up the following strategy $(X, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A}^M_{\chi}(\mathbb{G})$ where $M := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} M^n \mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{\Sigma}^n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} \widetilde{\Sigma}^k}(\omega)$:

$$X(\omega) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x^n \mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{\Sigma}^n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} \widetilde{\Sigma}^k}(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_t(\omega) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma^n_t(\omega) \mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{\Sigma}_n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} \widetilde{\Sigma}_k}(\omega).$$

Note that (X, γ) satisfies, for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $X(\omega) + \int_0^T \gamma(\omega)_t dS(\omega)_t \geq \xi(\omega)$ and hence

$$\sup_{\omega} X(\omega) + \int_0^T \gamma(\omega)_t dS(\omega)_t \geq \xi(\omega).$$

Thus

$$V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\Omega}(\xi) \leq \sup_{\omega} X(\omega) = \sup_{n} x^n \leq \sup_{n} V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\{Z=c_n\}} + \varepsilon \leq \sup_{c \in Z(\Omega)} V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\{Z=c\}} + \varepsilon = \sup_{c \in Z(\Omega)} V^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}} + \varepsilon,$$

where the last equality follows by definition since $\{Z = c\}$ is an atom of $\mathcal{G}^+_{-1}$ and hence $V^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}} = V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\{Z=c\}}$. As ε was arbitrary one has $\sup_{c\in Z(\Omega)} V^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}(\xi) \geq V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\Omega}(\xi)$. Since evidently for each $c \in Z(\Omega)$, $V^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}(\xi) \leq V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\Omega}(\xi)$, we finally get that $\sup_{c\in Z(\Omega)} V^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}}(\xi) = V^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\Omega}(\xi)$ thus first equality in (11) holds. By our assumption $\{\omega : \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F}}_{\{Z=Z(\omega)\}} \neq \emptyset\} = \Omega$ and pricing–hedging duality holds on $\{Z = c\}$ for each $c \in Z(\Omega)$. Thus the second equality in (11) follows. Whereas the third and fifth equalities in (11) hold by definition. To show the fourth one, note that, one inequality is immediate since for any c, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}^+}_{\{Z=c\}} \subset \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}^-}_{\Omega}$ and the other inequality then follows by Proposition 3.3.

The general case with non–empty set of options $\mathcal{X}$ follows by Theorem 4.3. □

5 Dynamic programming principle and pricing–hedging duality

To extend the initial enlargement perspective we study here the case where the additional information is disclosed at time $T_1 \in (0, T)$, i.e. the filtration $\mathbb{G}$ is of the form: $\mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{F}_t$ for $t \in [0, T_1)$ and $\mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \vee \sigma(Z)$ for $t \in [T_1, T]$. We divide our problem into two time intervals using the results from the previous sections. First we look at the pricing and hedging problems on $[T_1, T]$ and then on $[0, T_1]$. Along this section we assume that there are no dynamically traded options, i.e., $K = 0$. Moreover we assume that Z is of a special form, namely, Z satisfies

$$Z(\omega) = \begin{cases} \widetilde{Z}\left(\frac{\omega|_{[T_1,T]}}{\omega_{T_1}}\right) & \text{if} \quad \omega_{T_1} > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad \omega_{T_1} = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{for r.v. } \widetilde{Z} \text{ on } \Omega|_{[T_1,T]}. \tag{12}$$

This condition encodes the idea that the additional information only pertains to the evolution of prices after time T_1 irrespectively of the prices on, or before, time T_1.

We begin with two propositions where we develop the dynamic programming principle for two cases: superhedging cost and market model price. Note that the case $Z \equiv const.$ and $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{G}$ is also of interest, as it gives the dynamic programming principle under $\mathbb{F}$.

Proposition 5.1. *Let B^ω denote the $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$-atom containing ω. Then for a bounded uniformly continuous ξ the following hold.*
(i) The mapping $V^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}_{\Omega}(\xi) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$V^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}_{\Omega}(\xi)(\omega) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \exists\ \gamma \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{G}, [T_1, T]) \ \text{ such that } x + \int_{T_1}^{T} \gamma_t dS_t \geq \xi \text{ on } B^\omega\}$$

is uniformly continuous and $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$-measurable.
(ii) The dynamic programming principle holds in the form:

$$V^{\mathbb{G},[0,T]}_{\Omega}(\xi) = V^{\mathbb{F},[0,T_1]}_{\Omega}\left(V^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}_{\Omega}(\xi)\right).$$

PROOF: In the proof we denote $\widetilde{\xi} := V_{\Omega}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)$.
(i) Let $v := (v^1, ..., v^d) \in \Omega$ and $\widetilde{v} := (\widetilde{v}^1, ..., \widetilde{v}^d) \in \Omega$. Note that

$$\left|\widetilde{\xi}((v^1,..,v^d)) - \widetilde{\xi}((\widetilde{v}^1,..,\widetilde{v}^d))\right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{d} \left|\widetilde{\xi}((\widetilde{v}^1,..,\widetilde{v}^{k-1},v^k,..,v^d)) - \widetilde{\xi}((\widetilde{v}^1,..,\widetilde{v}^k,v^{k+1},..,v^d))\right|.$$

Thus, to establish uniform continuity of $\widetilde{\xi}$, it is enough to consider v and $\widetilde{v}$ which differ on one coordinate only and, without loss of generality, we may assume that $d = 1$.

Consider a small $\delta > 0$. Suppose that $||v - \widetilde{v}||_{[0,T_1]} \leq \delta$, $|v_{T_1} - \widetilde{v}_{T_1}| = D \geq 0$, $v_{T_1} > 0$ and $\widetilde{v}_{T_1} > 0$.
In the first step we show that $\widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) \leq \widetilde{\xi}(v) + \varepsilon$ for an appropriately chosen ε, depending only on ξ and δ. For each $\eta > 0$ there exists a strategy γ such that

$$\widetilde{\xi}(v) + \int_{T_1}^{T} \gamma_t dS_t \geq \xi - \eta \text{ on } B^v.$$

Let $\lambda = v_{T_1}/\widetilde{v}_{T_1} \in (0, \infty)$ and define the path modification mapping $\alpha^{v,\widetilde{v}}$ by

$$\alpha(\omega) := \alpha^{v,\widetilde{v}}(\omega) := \begin{cases} v|_{[0,T_1]} \otimes \frac{v_{T_1}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}\omega|_{[T_1,T]} & \omega \in B^{\widetilde{v}} \\ \widetilde{v}|_{[0,T_1]} \otimes \frac{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}{v_{T_1}}\omega|_{[T_1,T]} & \omega \in B^{v} \\ \omega & \omega \notin B^v \cup B^{\widetilde{v}} \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

where $\lambda\omega$ is a multiplicative modification of ω by λ in Ω and $v|_{[0,T_1]} \otimes \lambda\omega|_{[T_1,T]}$ means that the path is equal to v on $[0, T_1]$ and to $\lambda\omega|$ on $[T_1, T]$. Note that α is a bijection satisfying $\alpha = \alpha^{-1}$. Introduce a stopping time

$$\widetilde{\tau}(\omega) := \tau^{v,\widetilde{v}}(\omega) := \begin{cases} \inf\{t > T_1 : \omega_t - \widetilde{v}_{T_1} \geq \widetilde{v}_{T_1} D^{-\frac{1}{2}}\} \wedge T & \omega \in B^{\widetilde{v}} \\ \inf\{t > T_1 : \omega_t - v_{T_1} \geq v_{T_1} D^{-\frac{1}{2}}\} \wedge T & \omega \in B^{v} \\ T_1 & \omega \notin B^v \cup B^{\widetilde{v}} \end{cases}. \tag{14}$$

To show that $\widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) \leq \widetilde{\xi}(v) + \varepsilon$ we will consider a strategy $\lambda\gamma \circ \alpha + \frac{D^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}} \mathbb{1}_{[T_1,\widetilde{\tau})}$ on $B^{\widetilde{v}}$. The second term of this strategy is clearly $\mathbb{G}$-adapted. To show that the first term is $\mathbb{G}$-adapted as well, it is enough to show that $Z \circ \alpha$ is $\sigma(Z)$-measurable. The last is true since

$$Z \circ \alpha(\omega) = \widetilde{Z}\left(\frac{\alpha(\omega)|_{[T_1,T]}}{\alpha(\omega)_{T_1}}\right) = \widetilde{Z}\left(\frac{\omega|_{[T_1,T]}}{\omega_{T_1}}\right) = Z(\omega).$$

Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{\xi}(v) + \lambda \int_{T_1}^{T} \gamma \circ \alpha(\omega)_t dS_t(\omega) + \frac{D^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}(\omega_{\widetilde{\tau}} - \widetilde{v}_{T_1}) \\ &\quad = \widetilde{\xi}(v) + \int_{T_1}^{T} \gamma \circ \alpha(\omega)_t dS_t \circ \alpha(\omega) + \frac{D^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}(\omega_{\widetilde{\tau}} - \widetilde{v}_{T_1}) \\ &\quad \geq \xi \circ \alpha(\omega) - \eta + \frac{D^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}(\omega_{\widetilde{\tau}} - \widetilde{v}_{T_1}) \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is due to our definition of integration. In the case that $\widetilde{\tau}(\omega) = T$ one has

$$\frac{D^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}(\omega_{\widetilde{\tau}} - \widetilde{v}_{T_1}) \geq -\frac{D^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}\widetilde{v}_{T_1} = -D^{1/4}$$

and and

$$\|\alpha(\omega) - \omega\| \leq \delta \vee (\lambda - 1)\widetilde{v}_{T_1}(D^{-\frac{1}{2}} + 1) \leq 2\delta^{1/2}. \tag{15}$$

Thus, for $\widetilde{\tau}(\omega) = T$, it follows that

$$\xi \circ \alpha(\omega) - \eta + \frac{D^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}(\omega_\tau - \widetilde{v}_{T_1}) \geq \xi(\omega) - e_\xi(2\delta^{1/2}) - \eta - D^{1/4}$$

where e_ξ is modulus of continuity of ξ. Hence, for $\widetilde{\tau}(\omega) = T$, we deduce $\widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) \leq \widetilde{\xi}(v) + e_\xi(2\delta^{1/2}) + D^{1/4}$. In the case that $\widetilde{\tau}(\omega) < T$ one has

$$\frac{D^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}(\omega_{\widetilde{\tau}} - \widetilde{v}_{T_1}) = \frac{D^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}\widetilde{v}_{T_1} D^{-\frac{1}{2}} = D^{-1/4}$$

and

$$\xi \circ \alpha(\omega) - \eta + \frac{D^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}(\omega_\tau - \widetilde{v}_{T_1}) \geq -||\xi|| - \eta + D^{-1/4}$$

which, for D small enough ($D \leq (2||\xi||)^{-4}$), majorates $\xi(\omega)$. We deduce that $\widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) \leq \widetilde{\xi}(v) + e_\xi(2\delta^{1/2}) + D^{1/4}$.
Therefore, $\widetilde{\xi}$ is uniformly continuous on $\{\omega \in \Omega : \|\omega\| > 0\}$.
To complete the proof, we now consider the case where $\widetilde{v}_{T_1} = 0$. Let, for some small $\delta > 0$, $||v - \widetilde{v}||_{[0,T_1]} \leq \delta$ and $v_{T_1} = D > 0$. Firstly notice that $\widetilde{v}$ must satisfy $\widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) = \xi(\widetilde{v}|_{[0,T_1]} \otimes 0|_{[T_1,T]})$ since we can buy any amount of stock at price 0 at time T_1 thus only constant path is relevant, and therefore $\widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) \leq \widetilde{\xi}(v) + e_\xi(\delta)$. Now consider the strategy γ for $\omega \in B^v$ defined as

$$\gamma(\omega) := \delta^{-1/2}\mathbb{1}_{[T_1,\sigma(\omega))} \quad \text{where} \quad \sigma(\omega) := \inf\{t > T_1 : \omega_t - v_{T_1} \geq \delta^{1/4}\}.$$

Then, whenever $\sigma(\omega) < T$,

$$\widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) + \int_{T_1}^{T} \gamma(\omega)_t dS_t(\omega) = \widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) + \delta^{-1/2}(\omega_\sigma - v_{T_1}) = \widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) + \delta^{-1/4}$$

which, for d small enough, majorates $\xi(\omega)$. Otherwise, if $\sigma(\omega) = T$

$$\widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) + \int_{T_1}^{T} \gamma(\omega)_t dS_t(\omega) \geq \widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) - \delta^{1/2} \geq \xi(\omega) - e_\xi(2\delta^{1/4}) - \delta^{1/2}$$

since $||\widetilde{v} - \omega|| \leq 2\delta^{1/4}$. Therefore, $\widetilde{\xi}(v) \leq \widetilde{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) + e_\xi(2\delta^{1/4}) + \delta^{1/2}$.

(ii) Let $V^1 := V_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[0,T]}(\xi)$ and $V^2 := V_\Omega^{\mathbb{F},[0,T_1]}(\widetilde{\xi})$. For each $\eta > 0$ there exist $\gamma^1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{F},[0,T_1])$ and $\gamma^2 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{G},[T_1,T])$ such that

$$V^1 + \int_0^{T_1} \gamma_t^1 dS_t + \int_{T_1}^{T} \gamma_t^2 S_t \geq \xi - \eta \quad \text{on} \quad \Omega.$$

In particular, for a fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, the superhedging holds on B^v. Since $V^1 + \int_0^{T_1} \gamma_t^1 dS_t$ is constant on B^ω, we deduce that $V^1 + \int_0^{T_1} \gamma_t^1 dS_t \geq \widetilde{\xi}$ on $\Omega|_{[0,T_1]}$ and therefore $V^1 \geq V^2$. To prove the reverse inequality take $z > V^2$. Then there exists $\gamma^1 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{F},[0,T_1])$ such that $z + \int_0^{T_1} \gamma_t^1 dS_t \geq \widetilde{\xi}$ on Ω. Hence, for each $\eta > 0$, there exists a strategy $\gamma^2 \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{G},[T_1,T])$ such that $z + \int_0^{T_1} \gamma_t^1 dS_t + \int_{T_1}^{T} \gamma_t^2 S_t \geq \xi - \eta$. Then, clearly, $z \geq V^1$. □

Define the set of measures $\mathcal{M}_A^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}$ concentrated on $A \in \mathcal{F}_T$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_A^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]} := \{\mathbb{P} : S \text{ is a } \mathbb{G}\text{-martingale on } [T_1,T] \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(A) = 1\}.$$

Proposition 5.2. *Let B^ω denote the $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$-atom containing ω and assume that $\mathcal{M}_{B^\omega}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]} \neq \emptyset$ for each ω. Then for a bounded uniformly continuous ξ the following hold.*
(i) The mapping $P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)$ defined as $P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)(\omega) := \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}_{B^\omega}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}} \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}(\xi)$ is uniformly continuous and $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$-measurable.
(ii) The dynamic programming principle holds in the form:

$$P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[0,T]}(\xi) = P_\Omega^{\mathbb{F},[0,T_1]}(P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)).$$

Proof: In the proof we denote $\widehat{\xi} := P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)$.
(i) Let $v := (v^1,...,v^d) \in \Omega$ and $\widetilde{v} := (\widetilde{v}^1,...,\widetilde{v}^d) \in \Omega$. Note that

$$\left|\widehat{\xi}((v^1,..,v^d)) - \widehat{\xi}((\widetilde{v}^1,..,\widetilde{v}^d))\right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{d} \left|\widehat{\xi}((\widetilde{v}^1,..,\widetilde{v}^{k-1},v^k,..,v^d)) - \widehat{\xi}((\widetilde{v}^1,..,\widetilde{v}^k,v^{k+1},..,v^d))\right|.$$

Thus, to prove uniform continuity of $\widetilde{\xi}$, it is enough to consider v and $\widetilde{v}$ which differ on one coordinate only and, without loss of generality, we may assume that $d = 1$.
Suppose that $||v - \widetilde{v}||_{[0,T_1]} \leq \delta$ and $|v_{T_1} - \widetilde{v}_{T_1}| = D \geq 0$. It is enough to show that $\widehat{\xi}(\widetilde{v}) \leq \widehat{\xi}(v) + \varepsilon$ for an appropriately chosen ε depending only on ξ and δ. Take $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_{B^{\widetilde{v}}}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}$, i.e.: $\mathbb{P}(B^{\widetilde{v}}) = 1$, where $B^{\widetilde{v}} := \{\omega : \omega_t = \widetilde{v}_t \text{ for } t \in [0,T_1]\}$, $\mathbb{P}(S_{T_1} = \widetilde{v}_{T_1}) = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}(S_t \mathbb{1}_G) = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}(S_s \mathbb{1}_G)$ for each $T_1 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}_s$. Define measure $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ as $\bar{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbb{P} \circ \alpha$ with path modification α given in (13). Then $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ is an element of $\mathcal{M}_{B^v}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}$ since $\bar{\mathbb{P}}(B^v) = \mathbb{P}(\alpha(B^v)) = \mathbb{P}(B^{\widetilde{v}}) = 1$, it is a martingale measure on $[T_1,T]$ as for $T_1 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}_s$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}(S_t \mathbb{1}_G) = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}((S \circ \alpha)_t \mathbb{1}_{\alpha(G)}) = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}((S \circ \alpha)_s \mathbb{1}_{\alpha(G)}) = \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}(S_s \mathbb{1}_G),$$

where the second equality follow by $\alpha(G) \in \mathcal{G}_s$. The latter is true since, for any Borel set B, one has $\alpha(\{Z \in B\} \cap B^v) = B^{\widetilde{v}} \cap \{Z \in A\}$; the σ-field $\mathcal{F}_s$ coincides with trivial σ-field

up to $\mathbb{P}$-null sets and up to $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$-null sets; the general case follows from the monotone class argument. Hence, with $\widetilde{\tau}$ defined in (14),

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) - \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}(\xi)| &= |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi \circ \alpha)| \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}((\xi - \xi \circ \alpha)\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{\tau}=T\}}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}((\xi - \xi \circ \alpha)\mathbb{1}_{\{\widetilde{\tau}<T\}}) \\ &\leq e_{\xi}(2\delta^{1/2}) + 2||\xi||\frac{D}{D + D^{1/2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where in the last inequality we used (15), Doob's inequality and the fact that

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{\tau} < T) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\in[T_1,T]} S_t \geq \widetilde{v}_{T_1}(1 + D^{-1/2})\right) \leq \frac{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}}{\widetilde{v}_{T_1}(1 + D^{-1/2})} = \frac{D}{D + D^{1/2}}.$$

(ii) To prove that $P_{\Omega}^{\mathbb{G},[0,T]}(\xi) \leq P_{\Omega}^{\mathbb{F},[0,T_1]}(P_{\Omega}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi))$ it is enough to note that:

$$\sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}_{\Omega}^{\mathbb{G},[0,T]}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) = \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}_{\Omega}^{\mathbb{G},[0,T]}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\omega}(\xi)) \leq \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}_{\Omega}^{\mathbb{G},[0,T]}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sup_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}\in\mathcal{M}_{B^\omega}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}(\xi)\right)$$

where $\{\mathbb{P}_\omega\}$ is regular conditional distribution with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$ and where in the last step we used measurability implied by assertion (i).
Now we will show the remaining inequality. Let $\{\omega^n\}_n$ be a countable dense subset of $\Omega|_{[0,T_1]}$ and $B^n := B^{\omega^n}$. Define the path modification mapping $\alpha^{n,\omega}$ by $\alpha^{n,\omega} := \alpha^{\omega^n,\omega}$ where $\alpha^{\omega^n,\omega}$ is given in (13). Note that $\alpha^{n,\omega}$ is a bijection satisfying $\alpha^{n,\omega} = (\alpha^{n,\omega})^{-1}$. For any $\mathbb{P}_n \in \mathcal{M}_{B^n}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}$ the measure $\mathbb{P}_n \circ \alpha^{n,\omega}$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}_{B^\omega}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}$. Moreover, similarly to (16), we obtain that

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}(\xi) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n\circ\alpha^{n,\omega}}(\xi)| \leq e_{\xi}(2\delta^{1/2}) + 2||\xi||\frac{\delta}{\delta + \delta^{1/2}}$$

whenever $||\omega^n - \omega||_{[0,T_1]} \leq \delta$. Let us consider probability kernel $N_n : \Omega \to \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}$ defined by $N_n(\omega) := \mathbb{P}_n \circ \alpha^{n,\omega}$. The kernel N_n is $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable, i.e., $N_n(\omega, F) = \mathbb{P}_n \circ \alpha^{n,\omega}(F)$ is $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable for any $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$, since $(\omega, \widetilde{\omega}) \to \mathbb{1}_F \circ \alpha^{n,\omega}(\widetilde{\omega})$ is $\mathcal{F}_T \otimes \mathcal{F}_T$-measurable and bounded thus $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}(\mathbb{1}_F \circ \alpha^{n,\omega})$ is $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable (see [9, Section 3.3]). Then, since N_n is constant on atoms of $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$, we deduce from Blackwell's Theorem (see [13, Theorem 8.6.7] and/or [17, Ch III, §26, p.80-81]) that N_n is $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$-measurable probability kernel.
Denoting the closed ball around ω^n of radius δ by $\widetilde{B}^n(\delta) := \{\omega : \sup_{t\in[0,T_1]} |\omega_t - \omega_t^n| \leq \delta\}$, we observe that

$$\sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}_{\widetilde{B}^n(\delta)}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) = \sup_{\omega\in\widetilde{B}^n(\delta)} \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{M}_{B^\omega}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\xi) = \sup_{\omega\in\widetilde{B}^n(\delta)} \widehat{\xi}(\omega) \leq \widehat{\xi}(\omega^n) + \varepsilon(\delta)$$

where the second equality follows from uniform continuity of $\widehat{\xi}$.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Then we can chose $\delta > 0$ and family of measures $\mathbb{P}_n^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{M}_{B^n}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}$ for each n such that

$$\varepsilon/2 + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n^\varepsilon}(\xi) \geq \widehat{\xi}(\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \widetilde{B}^n(\delta) \quad \text{and} \quad e_\xi(2\delta^{1/2}) + 2||\xi||\delta/(\delta + \delta^{1/2}) \leq \varepsilon/2.$$

Let us now define the $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$-measurable probability kernel N^ε as

$$N^\varepsilon(\omega) := \mathbb{1}_{C^n}(\omega)\, \mathbb{P}_n^\varepsilon \circ \alpha^{n,\omega} \quad \text{where} \quad C^n := \widetilde{B}^n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} \widetilde{B}^k.$$

Probability kernel N^ε is constructed such that it satisfies

$$\varepsilon + \mathbb{E}_{N^\varepsilon(\omega)}(\xi) \geq \widehat{\xi}(\omega) \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad N^\varepsilon(\omega) \in \mathcal{M}_{B^\omega}^{\mathbb{G},[0,T_1]}.$$

There as well exists a measure $\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{M}_\Omega^{\mathbb{F},[0,T_1]}$ such that $\varepsilon + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon}(\widehat{\xi}) \geq \sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_\Omega^{\mathbb{F},[0,T_1]}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\widehat{\xi})$. The concatenation of measures $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon := \mathbb{P}^\varepsilon \otimes N^\varepsilon$ (see Section 3.1 in [26]), defined, for each $F \in \mathcal{F}_T$, as

$$\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon(F) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon}\Big(\sum_n \mathbb{1}_{C^n} N^\varepsilon(F) \Big)$$

is a probability measure. Note that regular conditional probabilities of $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon$ w.r.t $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$ equal to N^ε and $d\,\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon|_{\mathcal{F}_{T_1}} = d\,\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon|_{\mathcal{F}_{T_1}}$. Thus, for $s \leq t$ and $G_s \in \mathcal{G}_s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon}\big((S_t - S_s)\mathbb{1}_{G_s}\big) &= \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon}\big(\mathbb{E}_{N^\varepsilon}((S_t - S_s)\mathbb{1}_{G_s})\big) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon}\big(\mathbb{E}_{N^\varepsilon}((S_{s\vee T_1} - S_s)\mathbb{1}_{G_s})\big) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon}\big((S_{s\vee T_1} - S_s)\mathbb{1}_{G_s}\big) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon}\big((S_{s\vee T_1} - S_s)\mathbb{1}_{G_s}\big) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that S is a $(\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon, \mathbb{G})$-martingale. Moreover $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbb{P}}^\varepsilon}(\xi) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon}\big(\mathbb{E}_{N^\varepsilon}(\xi)\big) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon}(\widehat{\xi}) - \varepsilon \geq \sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_\Omega^{\mathbb{F},[0,T_1]}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(\widehat{\xi}) - 2\varepsilon.$$

The proof is completed. □

Remark 5.3. *The dynamic programming principle for P stated in Proposition 5.2 (ii) is linked to conditional sublinear expectations studied in [30, Theorem 2.3]. Since there is more structure in our set-up we prove it relying on uniform continuity of ξ instead of general analytic selection argument.*

Example 5.4. Consider $Z = |\ln S_T - \ln S_{T_1}|\mathbb{1}_{\{S_{T_1}=c\}\cap\{S_T>0\}}$. Then condition (12) is not satisfied. It also well illustrates why we cannot demand uniform continuity of $V_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)$ or $P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)$ without assuming (12).

Using analogous argumentation as in Sections 3 and 4, we derive, in Theorem 5.5, that there is no duality gap in $\mathbb{G}$. We treat independently each atom B^ω of $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$. Firstly, as in Theorem 4.5 for the corresponding $\mathbb{G}^+$ filtration, we look at the intersections with each level set of r.v. Z, namely at the sets $B^\omega \cap \{Z = c\}$ with form the atoms of $\mathcal{G}_{T_1}$. Secondly we aggregate over Z, as in Theorem 4.10 for the corresponding $\mathbb{G}^-$ filtration. The described operation reduces the problem to $[0, T_1]$ interval where $\mathbb{G}$ coincides with $\mathbb{F}$ where we conclude by dynamic programming principles.

Theorem 5.5. *Let Z be a random variable such that for each $c \in Z(\Omega)$ and each $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$-atom B^ω the set $\{Z = c\} \cap B^\omega$ satisfies Assumption 4.4 with no options ($\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$) on $[T_1, T]$ and that Assumption 4.9 holds. Assume moreover that $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega} \neq \emptyset$ and that Assumption 4.1 holds. Then for any bounded uniformly continuous ξ*

$$V_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)(\omega) = P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)(\omega) \quad \forall\omega \quad \textit{and} \quad V^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi) = P^{\mathbb{G}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{P},\Omega}(\xi).$$

Proof: In the first step of the proof we assume that $\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$. We use the previous subsection to show the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} V_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[0,T]}(\xi) &= V_\Omega^{\mathbb{F},[0,T_1]}(V_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)) = V_\Omega^{\mathbb{F},[0,T_1]}(P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)) \\ &= P_\Omega^{\mathbb{F},[0,T_1]}(P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)) = P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[0,T]}(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

After applying Propositions 5.1 and 5.2, it remains to show the second and third equalities. To prove the second equality that $P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi) = V_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)$ firstly we remark some analogies with Section 3. Defining the $(\mathbb{G}^+, [T_1, T])$-superhedging cost $V_A^{\mathbb{G}^+,[T_1,T]}$ as

$$V_A^{\mathbb{G}^+,[T_1,T]} := \inf\{x \in \mathcal{G}_{T_1} : \exists\, \gamma \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{G}, [T_1, T]) \text{ such that } x + \int_{T_1}^T \gamma_u dS_u \geq \xi \text{ on } A\},$$

analogously to Proposition 3.2 we have that

$$V_{B^\omega}^{\mathbb{G}^+,[T_1,T]}(\omega') = V_{B^\omega \cap \{Z=Z(\omega')\}}^{\mathbb{G}^+,[T_1,T]} \quad \text{for each } \omega \text{ and each } \omega' \in B^\omega.$$

Analogously to Proposition 3.5, we deduce that

$$P_{B^\omega}^{\mathbb{G}^+,[T_1,T]}(\omega') = P_{B^\omega \cap \{Z=Z(\omega')\}}^{\mathbb{G}^+,[T_1,T]} \quad \text{for each } \omega \text{ and each } \omega' \in B^\omega.$$

Then, by mimicking the proof of Theorem 4.10, we pass from "$\mathbb{G}^+$ to $\mathbb{G}^-$", and derive that

$$V_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)(\omega) = P_\Omega^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}(\xi)(\omega) \quad \forall\omega.$$

The third equality follows by general duality result on $[0, T_1]$.

The case of non-empty set of options $\mathcal{X}$ follows by Theorem 4.3. □

Example 5.6. Analogously to Example 4.7 let us look at the additional information in dynamic set-up which consists of a very detailed knowledge. We consider a one-dimensional setting with no statically or dynamically traded options: $d = 1$, $K = 0$ and $\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$. The informed agent acquires at time T_1 detailed knowledge of the stock prices process of the form

$$Z = \begin{cases} \sup_{t\in[T_1,T]} |\ln S_t - \ln S_{T_1}| & S_t > 0 \quad \forall\, t \in [T_1, T] \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Note that for each $c \in Z(\Omega)$ and each $\mathcal{F}_{T_1}$-atom B^ω, one has that

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G},[T_1,T]}_{\{Z=c\}\cap B^\omega} = \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{F},[T_1,T]}_{\{Z=c\}\cap B^\omega} \neq \emptyset$$

where the first equality holds since each $\{Z = c\} \cap B^\omega$ is a $\mathcal{G}_{T_1}$-atom. To show that

$$P^{\mathbb{F},[T_1,T]}_{\{Z=c\}\cap B^\omega} = \widetilde{P}^{\mathbb{F},[T_1,T]}_{\{Z=c\}\cap B^\omega}$$

we use the same arguments as in Example 4.7. Thus Assumption 4.4 with no options ($\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$) on $[T_1, T]$ is satisfied for each each set $\{Z = c\} \cap B^\omega$. Let $\{c_n\}_n$ be a countable subset of $Z(\Omega)$ such that $c_1 = 1$. Then Assumption 4.9 is satisfied for $\{c_n\}_n$. Moreover note that, by concatenation of measure argument, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{G}}_\Omega \neq \emptyset$ and, since $\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$, Assumption 4.1 is also satisfied. We now apply Theorem 5.5 to show that there is no duality gap in $\mathbb{G}$.

Example 5.7. Analogously to Example 4.8 we consider the additional information in dynamic set-up of binary type. The same as before we consider a one-dimensional setting with no statically or dynamically traded options: $d = 1$, $K = 0$ and $\mathcal{X} = \emptyset$. The informed agent acquires at time T_1 knowledge of of the form

$$Z = \mathbb{1}_{\left\{a<\frac{S_t}{S_{T_1}}<b \ \forall\, t\in[T_1,T]\right\}} \qquad \text{where} \qquad a < 1 < b.$$

Along the lines of Example 5.6, applying Theorem 5.5, we deduce that there is no duality gap in $\mathbb{G}$.

References

[1] B. Acciaio, M. Beiglböck, F. Penkner, and W. Schachermayer. A model-free version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing and the super-replication theorem. *Mathematical Finance*, 2013. DOI: 10.1111/mafi.12060.

[2] B. Acciaio, A. M. G. Cox, and M. Huesmann. Private communication.

[3] B. Acciaio and M. Larsson. Semi-static completeness and robust pricing by informed investors. arXiv:1510.01890, 2015.

[4] M. Avellaneda, A. Levy, and A. Parás. Pricing and hedging derivative securities in markets with uncertain volatilities. *Applied Math Finance*, 2(2):73–88, 1995.

[5] M. Beiglbčk, A. M. G. Cox, M. Huesmann, N. Perkowski, and D. J. Prömel. Pathwise super-replication via vovk's outer measure. arXiv:1504.03644, 2015.

[6] M. Beiglböck, A. M. G. Cox, and M. Huesmann. Optimal transport and Skorokhod embedding. arXiv:1307.3656v3, 2015.

[7] M. Beiglböck, P. Henry-Labordère, and F. Penkner. Model-independent bounds for option prices: a mass transport approach. *Finance and Stochastics*, 17(3):477–501, 2013.

[8] S. Biagini, B. Bouchard, C. Kardaras, and M. Nutz. Robust fundamental theorem for continuous processes. *Math. Finance*, 2015. DOI: 10.1111/mafi.12110.

[9] V. I. Bogachev. *Measure theory*, volume 1, 2. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.

[10] B. Bouchard and M. Nutz. Arbitrage and duality in nondominated discrete-time models. *Ann. Appl. Prob*, 25(2):823–859, 2015.

[11] H. Brown, D. Hobson, and L. C. G. Rogers. Robust hedging of barrier options. *Math. Finance*, 11(3):285–314, 2001.

[12] M. Burzoni, M. Frittelli, and M. Maggis. Universal arbitrage aggregator in discrete time markets under uncertainty. arXiv:1407.0948v2, 2015.

[13] D. L. Cohn. *Measure theory*, volume 165. Springer, 1980.

[14] A. M. G. Cox and J. Obłój. Robust hedging of double touch barrier options. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 2:141–182, 2011.

[15] A. M. G. Cox and J. Obłój. Robust pricing and hedging of double no-touch options. *Finance and Stochastics*, 15(3):573–605, 2011.

[16] A. M. G. Cox and J. Wang. Root's barrier: Construction, optimality and applications to variance options. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 23(3):859–894, 2013.

[17] C. Dellacherie and P.-A. Meyer. *Probabilitś et potentiel*, volume Chapitres I–IV. Herman, Paris, 1975.

[18] L. Denis and C. Martini. A theoretical framework for the pricing of contingent claims in the presence of model uncertainty. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 16(2):827–852, 2006.

[19] Y. Dolinsky and H. M. Soner. Martingale optimal transport and robust hedging in continuous time. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 160(1):391–427, 2014.

[20] Y. Dolinsky and H. M. Soner. Martingale optimal transport in the Skorokhod space. *arXiv:1404.1516*, 2014.

[21] D. Hobson. Robust hedging of the lookback option. *Finance and Stochastics*, 2(4):329–347, August 1998.

[22] Z. Hou and J. Obłój. On robust pricing–hedging duality in continuous time. arXiv:1503.02822, 2015.

[23] J. Jacod and M. Yor. Etude des solutions extrémales et représentation intégrale des solutions pour certains problèmes de martingales. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 38(2):83–125, 1977.

[24] T. Jeulin. *Semi-martingales et grossissement d'une filtration*, volume 833 of *Lecture Notes in Math.* Springer, 1980.

[25] T. Jeulin and M. Yor. Grossissement d'une filtration et semi-martingales: formules explicites. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XII*, pages 78–97. Springer, 1978.

[26] N. E. Karoui and X. Tan. Capacities, measurable selection and dynamic programming part I: abstract framework. arXiv:1310.3363, 2013.

[27] T. J. Lyons. Uncertain volatility and the risk-free synthesis of derivatives. *Applied Math Finance*, 2(2):117–133, 1995.

[28] R. Mansuy and M. Yor. *Random times and enlargements of filtrations in a Brownian setting*, volume 1873 of *Lecture Notes in Math.* Springer, Berlin, 2006.

[29] P. A. Mykland. Financial options and statistical prediction intervals. *Ann. Statist.*, 31(5):1413–1438, 2003.

[30] M. Nutz and R. van Handel. Constructing sublinear expectations on path space. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 123(8):3100–3121, 2013.

[31] D. W. Stroock and S. S. Varadhan. *Multidimensional diffusion processes.* Springer, 2007.

[32] F. Terkelsen. Some minimax theorems. *Mathematica Scandinavica*, 31:405–413, 1972.